

**Amendments to the Drawing**

Fig. 2A, please add reference numerals 605, 401, and 301, consistent with numerals used in Fig. 6. A replacement Fig. 2A, without markings, accompanies this paper.

Fig. 2B, please add reference numerals 704, 501 and 301, consistent with numerals used in Fig. 7. A replacement Fig. 2B, without markings, accompanies this paper.

**REMARKS**

In an Office Action dated October 26, 2005, the Examiner required cancellation of non-elected claims; objected to the title; objected to the drawing; objected to the abstract; rejected claims 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Young (U.S. Patent 4,669,281); rejected claims 9 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over *Young* in view of Betzler (U.S. Patent 6,056,563); and rejected claims 6, 10, 14, 15, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over *Young*. Claims 7, 8, 16, and 17 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but otherwise indicated to contain allowable subject matter.

***Title & Abstract***

Applicants have amended the title to include the language suggested by the Examiner. Applicants have further amended the abstract to include the language suggested by the Examiner. These amendments overcome the objections to the title and abstract. No new matter is introduced.

***Drawing***

Applicants have amended Figs. 2A and 2B to include the reference numerals suggested by the Examiner. Replacement drawing sheets accompany this response. No new matter is introduced. The amendments overcome the objections to the drawing.

***Prior Art***

Applicants have amended independent claim 6 to include the limitations recited in original dependent claim 7, which the Examiner indicated was allowable. As amended, independent claim 6 is of identical scope to original claim 7, but in independent form. Dependent claim 7 has accordingly been cancelled as superfluous, and dependent claim 8 amended to correct the chain of

dependency. Since claim 7 contained allowable subject matter, amended claim 6 is now allowable, as are claims 8-10, which depend from it.

Applicants have amended independent claim 11 to include limitations similar to those deemed allowable in dependent claims 7 and 16 (although no analogous dependent claim was originally presented for claim 11). I.e., claim 11 has been amended to recite that the first and second members are both L-shaped members, and that they lock together in a nested configuration. As amended, claim 11 is patentable for essentially the same reasons that claim 7 is now patentable.

Applicants have rewritten claim 16 in independent form, incorporating all the limitations of original claim 14, from which it depended. Since the Examiner indicated that claim 16 contained allowable subject matter, and claim 16 was objected to solely for dependence on a rejected base claim, claim 16, being independent, is now allowable. Claim 17, and new claims 22-25, are dependent on claim 16 and allowable for the same reasons.

Independent claim 14 has been amended to recite additional limitations not previously recited in the claims. Specifically, claim 14 as amended recites that the first and second members are attached to the respective electronic device and cable coupling using threaded fasteners which traverse through holes in the first and second members, and that in the coupled configuration the threaded fasteners face in opposite directions.

These various features are not taught or suggested by *Young*. *Young*'s "locking cover" engages the "first structure" in a sliding fashion and is locked in place with a lock cylinder. *Young*'s "locking cover" does not attach to anything via threaded fasteners which traverse through holes in the "locking cover". *Young* shows only a single set of threaded fasteners which traverse

through holes in the “first structure”, and there is no second set of threaded fasteners facing in a direction opposite the first set.

Nor does the secondary reference, *Betzler*, provide the necessary teaching or suggestion of these recited features. *Betzler* also shows a box-like structure which encloses an electrical plug and which slidably or otherwise engages a “closure wall”. Neither member is attached to the plug, or any electronic device, with threaded fasteners, and the limitation regarding threaded fasteners facing opposite directions is not taught or suggested.

New claim 21, which depends from claim 14, further recites that the members are flat, elongated members which lie adjacent each other their elongated length. This additional feature is neither taught nor suggested by *Young* or *Betzler*, since in both references one of the members is a box-like member.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all claims. In addition, the Examiner is encouraged to contact applicants’ attorney by telephone if there are outstanding issues left to be resolved to place this case in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

TIMOTHY J. MASSARO, et al.

By: 

Roy W. Tritelson

Registration No. 34,265

Telephone: (507) 202-8725

Docket No.: ROC920010314US1  
Serial No.: 10/051,578